United Nations A/C.2/65/2

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 October 2010

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Second Committee
Agenda item 17
Information and communication technologies for development

Letter dated 21 October 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Lithuania to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit the letter of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Lithuania, Mr. Andrius Kubilius, and the Chair's summary of the fifth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum, held from 14 to 17 September 2010 in Vilnius (see annex).

I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 17.

(*Signed*) Dalius **Čekuolis**
Permanent Representative

10-60685 (E) 101110

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 21 October 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Lithuania to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Letter dated 20 October 2010 from the Prime Minister of the Republic of Lithuania addressed to the Secretary-General

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania, I have the honour to transmit the Chair's summary of the fifth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), held from 14 to 17 September 2010 in Vilnius (see enclosure).

This recently hosted high-profile information society event proved to be a huge success. A large number of representatives from nearly 100 countries across all stakeholder groups met in workshops to discuss a wide range of topics related to Internet governance. Increased remote participation allowed stakeholders, who had limited or no possibility to travel, to follow and participate in the process online. Pursuant to the recommendations of the Internet Governance Forum held in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, a new format placing a higher priority on development was introduced at the fifth meeting. The Forum clearly demonstrated that its strength lies in cooperation among multi-stakeholder groups, based on the exchange of information and the sharing of best practices.

The Forum continues to provide an excellent framework for an ever-evolving, self-improving and non-binding multi-stakeholder approach. In this regard, I assure you that Lithuania remains a staunch supporter of the continuation of the Forum and the extension of its mandate for the next five years. It is equally important that the current principles of the functioning of the Forum should be maintained in accordance with paragraph 77 of the Tunis Agenda. The continuation of the Forum would help to further expand its potential as a unique platform for discussion and as a brainstorming session for generating many new ideas and best solutions among all relevant stakeholders and participants.

(*Signed*) Andrius **Kubilius**

Enclosure

Fifth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum

Vilnius, 14 to 17 September 2010

Chair's summary

1. The fifth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) was held in Vilnius, from 14 to 17 September 2010.[a] It focused on the overall theme of "IGF 2010: Developing the future together".

2. With close to 2,000 badges issued and 1,461 participants, attendance at the Vilnius meeting was similar to the 2009 meeting in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt.

3. Parallel to the main sessions, 113 workshops, best practice forums, dynamic coalition meetings and open forums were scheduled around the broad themes of the main sessions and the Forums overall mandate.

4. The programme and meetings were prepared in a series of open multi-stakeholder consultations, held throughout 2010, in accordance with the Forum's interactive and participatory process.

5. The entire meeting was webcast, with video streaming provided from the main session room and all nine other meeting rooms. All proceedings were transcribed and displayed in the meeting rooms in real time and streamed to the Web. This set-up allowed for remote participants to interact with the meeting. All main sessions had simultaneous interpretation in all the official United Nations languages. The text transcripts and the video and audio records of all the official meetings are archived on the Forum's website.

6. Remote participation was strengthened in cooperation with the remote participation working group. Remote hubs in 32 locations around the world provided the means for more than 600 people who could not travel to the meeting to participate actively in the Forum and contribute to the discussions.

I. Opening ceremony

7. In his opening address to the meeting, Mr. Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, expressed gratitude to the Government and people of Lithuania for their warm welcome and generous hospitality on behalf of Mr. Sha Zukang, Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs. Mr. Sundaram remarked that the theme of the 2010 gathering "developing the future together", was particularly appropriate given the Forum's achievements to date, the commitment of the Geneva and Tunis outcomes and the goals of the World Summit on the Information Society. He noted that, while Internet use was increasing, it was growing faster in the developed world than in developing regions and that the digital divide was growing rather than shrinking.

[a] An expanded version of the Chair's summary, providing more details and the names of all session chairs, moderators, speakers, panellists and attendance statistics, is available from the IGF website http://www.intgovforum.org/cms.

8. Ms. Dalia Grybauskaitė, President of the Republic of Lithuania, told the meeting that Lithuania enjoyed one of the highest Internet speeds and mobile phone penetration rates in the world. She noted that the Internet had become an integral part of everyday life. It was impossible to imagine modern business, public services, the spread of information, cultural exchanges, person-to-person contacts, entertainment and leisure without the global electronic network. Furthermore, the development of the Internet was crucial to worldwide progress and the interests of all stakeholders. However, she also introduced a note of caution. While the Internet was essential to the development of knowledge society, it also posed new challenges relating to privacy, data security and threats related to child abuse, e-theft and intellectual property rights. Those were issues that the Forum could address, so that the international community could take action to help to overcome the newly emerging challenges. A closer and more open dialogue between the interested stakeholders was required. The international community had no choice but to work together to create a more reliable and more secure Internet for tomorrow.

9. Mr. Eligijus Masiulis, Minister of Transport and Communications, Republic of Lithuania, assumed the chairmanship of the conference on behalf of the host country and thanked the Forum participants for the honour of chairing the meeting. He noted that the Internet played an integral and very important role in the economic development of all countries. In his own role as the Minister responsible for information and communication technologies and transportation, he commented that the Internet played an important role in the efficient development of roads, railways and other means of transport. It also improved trade, facilitated the export of services, stimulated the business environment and promoted competitiveness. The Internet had shown that it contributed to the growth of the gross domestic product (GDP) of all countries and that the Internet and information technologies were of utmost importance to contemporary society. The policy questions associated with those issues were a priority for Lithuania and the focus of the Forum. Lithuania recognized the importance of the Forum and would continue to be active in it.

10. Speakers representing all stakeholder groups addressed the session. Several themes emerged throughout the various talks. Almost all the speakers made it clear that they supported the continuation of the Forum. It was noted that the Forum process was gaining momentum and a number of speakers commented on the valuable outcomes from the Forum and the ever-increasing number of related national and regional meetings. The Government of Kenya offered to host the sixth meeting of the Forum in 2011 and sought the support of participants for its expression of interest.

11. A number of speakers pointed out that it was important for the Forum to remain multi-stakeholder in nature. The Forum should remain a place for open exchanges without the pressure of having to negotiate outcomes. While improvements were called for, it was important that the Forum should maintain its special nature as a multi-stakeholder process, which was what gave it its legitimacy.

12. Several speakers mentioned the importance of "the Internet way", a decentralized open and inclusive multi-stakeholder collaboration that allowed for innovation and creativity at the edges. They stressed the importance of Internet governance continuing in a decentralized way. Just as the Internet had unleashed the creativity of people around the world, the Forum had inspired the growth in creativity that the multi-stakeholder model brought to policymaking. The Forum had

provided a way to exchange opinions, ideas and concerns and had allowed for the improvement of Internet governance.

13. Other speakers reminded the Forum of the importance of the user, from the poorest to the richest, in the governance discussions, and spoke of the importance of universal access while guaranteeing security and promoting diversity. The importance of creating and maintaining a civil rights framework for the Internet, including the right to privacy, was also mentioned. Another common theme was the protection of rights in general, particularly those of children, women, persons with disabilities and vulnerable members of society.

14. The importance of maintaining a focus on expanding the Internet to the billions of users who did not yet have access was emphasized by several speakers. As part of that general theme, it was pointed out that, as the number of Internet users grew worldwide, emerging economies would soon have more Internet users than the European Union and the United States combined. Several speakers noted that the Forum must recognize that the Internet was a globally important infrastructure and must agree that its governance also be global in nature.

II. Themes of the main sessions

A. Managing critical Internet resources

15. The session was designed around a number of feeder workshops that provided input for discussion around the four main sub-themes:

- The status of IPv6 availability around the world; examples and cases
- The internationalization of critical Internet resources management and enhanced cooperation
- The importance of new top-level domains (TLDs) and international domain names (IDNs) for development
- Maintaining Internet services in situations of disaster and crisis

16. Regarding IPv6 deployment, the point was made that Governments, as early adopters and providers of important services, had a clear role to play in procurement and could act as a model of good practice for others.

17. The deployment of IPv6 was likened to the migration from leaded to unleaded petrol: for a period of time unleaded petrol was only available in a few places, but quickly, the situation reversed and leaded petrol became difficult to find. The same pattern was seen to be emerging with IPv6. A number of speakers commented that Governments were major buyers in communications markets and, consequently, they had the power to influence the direction of technology through their procurement policies. Tendering processes could include the requirement that equipment be IPv6-ready. It was noted that Internet service providers (ISPs) in developing countries had less legacy equipment and, therefore, new ISPs in developing countries often had more modern, IPv6-ready equipment. Another speaker commented that some of the first all-IPv6 networks would probably be available in a developing country environment.

18. The second part of the meeting dealt with the sub-theme "The internationalization of critical Internet resources management and enhanced

cooperation". The Chairman of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) introduced issues his organization had worked on in the past year. In particular, he highlighted improved cooperation and coordination with Governments and the Government Advisory Committee. A number of speakers noted two important deadlines, the end of the root server contracts between the Government of the United States of America and ICANN and VeriSign respectively. Those were opportunities for further progress in enhanced cooperation. Any evolution should ensure the same level of protection and security that the current system provided, and the management system needed to be perfected to ensure global resources were shared equitably. The Chair of a review team created by the Affirmation of Commitments told the meeting that the work on accountability and transparency focused on how ICANN managed its public input processes, its policy development processes and decision-making.

19. The third sub-theme of the session was "The importance of new TLDs (top-level domains) and IDNs (internationalized domain names) for development". ICANN had created a working group to look at the issue of the impact of new generic top-level domains (gTLDs) on developing countries. The working group focused on the different kinds of support that might be offered to new gTLD applicants from needy and underserved groups.

20. A speaker from the Haitian registry reported on the remarkable achievement of his country code top levels domain (ccTLD) in ensuring continuity of service despite the destruction of the local infrastructure following the earthquake in January 2010. One of the lessons learned was that it was necessary to adopt best common practices regarding the operation of the Domain Name System (DNS). It was also important to have a geographic network diversity to avoid point of failure. In Haiti, efforts were now being made to develop local capacity. That was important, as in some developing countries, there were often only one or two people operating the ccTLD.

21. With respect to the fourth sub-theme, the representative of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) described the work the organization had done following the recent floods in Pakistan and other natural disasters. The Union had appealed to the international community to help the Pakistani administration to restore its communication infrastructure, which had been badly hit by the disaster.

22. In his own closing remarks, the Chair noted that the Internet only existed because consumers — either businesses or individuals — wanted to remain connected and consume Internet products. The management of critical Internet resources must ensure access to content needed by Internet users.

B. Access and diversity

23. The session focused on access to infrastructure and to content, and considered a range of issues from geolocation, the global reach of social networks and the linkages between access to knowledge and security solutions, both in terms of hardware and software.

24. In terms of infrastructure, the need for continued broadband expansion was seen as crucial by several of the speakers. The importance of inexpensive but powerful wireless handsets and other devices was also listed as a critical ingredient in achieving global access. The tools that would enable hardware and software

developers to develop networks and devices according to universal design principles were also necessary. The biggest drivers on connectivity were related to poverty, level of education and geographic location, with people in developing countries less likely to have access than those in developed countries.

25. Discussions also revolved around the reasons why access was important. In developed regions, the Internet was generally considered an everyday tool for communication and social interactions, as well as a mechanism to conduct online services. In developing regions, it was needed to gain access to knowledge, for example, about health care or how to build water purification systems that could save lives. Access to the Internet was described as an indispensable tool to improve the quality of life of persons disadvantaged by poverty, migrant status, disability and gender.

26. Three things were needed for a multilingual Internet: internationalization of domain names, availability of local content and localization of applications and tools. The first was in the process of being met with the introduction of IDNs and ccTLDs, so that websites could be named in local scripts and languages. Several speakers referred to the next critical need, which was local content in local languages and local scripts. Without that, most populations in the world, who were not familiar with English or the Latin character sets would not have real access. For that to happen, there needed to be development in the mechanisms for producing and distributing relevant local content.

27. Beyond the language aspects of diversity, speakers described the need for universal design, so that people with various levels of ability and disability would have equal access. The right to a multilingual, accessible Internet was seen as a citizen's right and a Government's obligation, not something to be left to market forces alone.

28. The increase in the use of filters installed to block content that was considered illegal or harmful was also discussed. The need to balance autonomy with protection of the public good was also raised, and it was argued that filtering had a negative impact on access to knowledge, particularly by students. In his closing remarks, the Chair made the point that, without openness, access lost its purpose.

C. Security, openness and privacy

29. Openness and privacy were examined through three thematic lenses:

- Issues related to social media
- The nature and characteristics of Internet networks, technologies and standards
- International cooperation and collaboration on security, privacy and openness

30. Most of the new technology devices used to manage our daily lives were not powerful enough to hold all the applications or data needed. Those would need to be located in the cloud, which would mean having to trust remote data storage facilities and services. The question was how to provide reasonable privacy and security for individuals and entities that were using that new computing continuum.

31. From a human rights perspective, the right to privacy was a fundamental permanent right, and security was a necessity for exercising all rights. So what was

needed was not to balance security against privacy, but to work out how to enhance both simultaneously and not allow one to erode the other.

32. New social media enabled a new type of interactive communication that enhanced communication between groups and individuals. Because information was shared, it was important to safeguard the security of the data and protect the privacy of personal information. Writing on the Internet was different from the ephemeral nature of spoken communication, which was lost, while what was communicated online remained. A number of speakers noted that personal data had tremendous commercial value, and that new laws to address that situation should be considered.

33. The point was made by many speakers that new actors had entered the media system and that the traditional means of regulating the media were no longer applicable. Media now included search engines as well as social networks. However, a representative from a social network company said it was a mistake to think the Internet was an unregulated space, when many laws and regulations existed. Online companies had to respect and work with regulators and different authorities on a daily basis. A clear point was made that the problem of crime in the offline world had not been solved, and while that should not stop efforts to address crime online, there was also a need to be realistic.

34. A United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) commission report on policy approaches that shaped freedom of expression on the Internet had found that, with increased access to information in cyberspace, censorship and filtering was done not only by Governments, but also by private companies.

35. The session also addressed issues of international cooperation and collaboration, and considered human rights norms and conventions. The Convention on Cybercrime was mentioned as one of the tools that addressed cybercrime standards and norms. It had the force of law and could potentially be applied worldwide, and had been drafted with the participation of non-European countries.

36. Threats to cybersecurity came from a number of sources, such as outdated legal architecture, bad practices and natural disasters that contribute to cyber insecurity. The moderator noted that the speed at which cybercrime evolved was so fast that legislation was not competent to address it.

37. In his closing remarks, the Chair noted that it was of paramount importance to make the Internet safe for children and youngsters. He also noted that the lack of skills of ordinary users was itself a serious threat to the security of the Internet. Capacity-building was essential to the future security of the Internet, he concluded.

D. Internet governance for development

38. Internet governance for development has been a cross-cutting priority of the Forum since the first meeting in Athens in 2006. At the 2010 meeting, it was introduced as a new theme for a main session.

39. The participants in the session explored the possible effects of global Internet governance arrangements on the development of the Internet in developing countries. They considered the institutional processes and substantive policy outputs of governance arrangements and whether those might raise developmental concerns that had not received sufficient attention to date.

40. The participants looked at the meaning of Internet governance for development and made the following points:

Internet governance for development:

(a) Needed to be understood from the perspective of a sustainable development that met three needs: social equity, preservation of the environment and economic efficiency;

(b) Meant governance that adequately and proportionally represents developing countries in its mechanisms and processes;

(c) Must enable innovation in developing countries;

(d) Advanced the development of the Internet in developing and transitional countries and promoted Internet-enabled development;

(e) Took a global view and provided governance for both the developing and developed worlds.

41. Other points included the following:

(a) The Internet was critical for the development of developing nations;

(b) The demographics of the Internet were changing and the voice of the developing countries needed to be included in the way the Internet was governed and managed;

(c) Internet governance for development must be seen in terms of its impact on ordinary people and of human development;

(d) Development needed to be considered in every Internet governance decision.

42. Subsequent discussions focused on how developing and other countries organized and managed their national-level engagement with global Internet governance in the context of their wider national information and communications technology (ICT) strategies.

43. Several speakers described the process in their countries or regions:

(a) Brazil discussed its multi-stakeholder national governance process with representatives from Government, the private sector and civil society. It was described as a lightweight process that was not expensive. Mention was also made of the Internet principles that Brazil had standardized and which were being acknowledged in many of the Forum's sessions and workshops.

(b) Senegal pointed to its national Internet Governance Forum and to its Head of State, who was very involved in ICT and the World Summit on the Information Society process. The focus in Senegal had been to build out the broadband infrastructure. The country had also put considerable effort into its research and education network. One challenge facing ICT in Senegal was how to serve a population with a 70 per cent illiteracy rate.

44. The participants then proposed ways to take an Internet governance for development agenda forward in the Forum and other international settings:

(a) An evaluation of different Internet governance initiatives should be carried out to understand their impact on development;

(b) National and regional meetings modelled on the Forum should be held in developing countries.

45. In his closing remarks, the moderator remarked on the fact that, on the one hand, the Internet was highly complex and, on the other, it was very easy to use. That created a disinterest in Internet governance with most people, as they just could not see the need, unless it was related to the cost of local access.

46. The Chair concluded by mentioning an old saying that there was only a short distance between strict dictatorship and uncontrollable anarchy, and mentioned his belief that multi-stakeholder governance could help to prevent those extremes.

E. Emerging issues: cloud computing

47. This session provided an overview of the issues from both the policy and the technical standpoints, and provided an initial exploration of possible Internet governance considerations within cloud computing.

48. In his introduction, the Chair described some of the challenges in meeting the promise of cloud computing, including in terms of both computer science and expense, as well as in terms of security and privacy.

49. Panellists described the cloud as a continuation of the network that existed in the past. Within the cloud, one is not only able to programme software but also to programme the whole infrastructure of the Internet and offer it as a service. The benefit to consumers is significant, as the cloud functions essentially as a black box. Services operate consistently, regardless of the underlying systems. The cloud offers the Internet the same advantages that the distribution of electricity had offered in the past. Just as consumers of electricity no longer had to generate their own electricity, now consumers of information technology no longer need to maintain their own information technology infrastructure. As the mobile world continues to expand rapidly, the cloud plays a crucial role; current portable devices lack the storage capacities and power of full-size machines and need the cloud to provide them with their core services.

50. A panellist raised concerns about the security measures in and around the cloud and whether stored user records required adequate, effective and enforceable protection in order to generate the confidence needed for users to take up those services. Cloud service providers would have to be transparent and accountable for their services, including modification requirements and independent data security audits, to ensure the safety of the data.

51. Another area of concern was the difference in policy among countries regarding what could be done with undisclosed personal data. Law enforcement would have easier means of accessing that data. The cloud should be protected by the same safeguards against public and private interference that were currently used to protect data on desks or on hard drives.

52. The following questions were raised:

(a) Would the cloud become dominated by a few large companies, just as the major utilities firms had dominated the field of electrical distribution?

(b) Would the utility nature of the cloud help or hinder innovation, and what policies would be needed to mitigate any negative effect of the cloud?

(c) What framework would be needed, given the complexity of cloud computing, to build trust in the cloud, especially in terms of confidentiality and privacy?

53. The Session Chair concluded by looking at the various facets of cloud computing, ranging from the infrastructure to social and policy issues. He mentioned the security problems involved and noted that efforts to secure data and computing procedures were becoming more complicated. He also linked the emerging issue of loud computing to the "Internet of Things", which, in his view, was the emerging issue for future Forum meetings.

F. Taking stock of Internet governance and the way forward

54. The participants in the session took stock of the evolution of the overall Internet governance landscape since the first Forum meeting in Athens in 2006. It established a checkpoint on the changes in the practice of Internet governance during the first five years of the Forum. It also set a baseline from which to measure the changes over the next five years, leading up to the 10-year review of the implementation of and follow-up to the outcome of the World Summit on the Information Society in 2015. Contributors focused on the current status of Internet governance in the Internet and on how it had changed since the Forum had been created.

55. It was generally felt that the themes defined in 2006 were still very relevant today and that the discussions had matured and deepened over the years.

56. The participants discussed whether the context of the discussions had changed since the meeting in Athens. Several speakers noted that, as the context of the Internet had changed, so had the discussion in the Forum. It was pointed out that the Internet had grown in the last five years and that the Internet in 2010 was not the same as the Internet in 2005. The Forum was seen as having grown alongside the Internet.

57. While speakers acknowledged that there was still much work to be done, the discussions had matured and moved from basic explanations to good practices and deployment issues. Speakers felt that progress had been made on some issues, such as the internationalization of critical Internet resources. The discussions had moved on from the need to explain the importance of multilingualism to the methods of deploying internationalized domain names (IDNs) and of user content in diverse languages and scripts. Another way that the conversations had changed was that they had moved from theoretical discourse to practical discussions.

58. Several speakers, including several parliamentarians, mentioned the Forum's success and growth over the years. One of the significant examples was the widespread introduction of regional and national meetings modelled on the Forum in the past two years. The national initiatives had contributed to debates among Government, parliamentarians, industry and civil society. That had changed the nature of Internet governance in the countries concerned and had led to moves towards cooperative models of regulation. The maturation of the discussions over the years was mentioned as evidence of advancement in global governance. Specific topics such as the growth of IXPs (Internet exchange points) and the awareness of the need to address issues concerning IPv4 and IPv6 were listed as examples of the progress in global governance during the five years of the Forum. The

multi-stakeholder model, largely initiated at the Forum, was also seen as an advance in global Internet governance. That included the ability of all stakeholders to speak and listen to each other. Many speakers attached great importance to capacity-building. They described the proliferation of national and regional Forums as a testament to the growth in both individual and institutional capacity.

59. While several speakers talked about the need for a more results-oriented Forum, others considered that the Forum's practice of not negotiating outcomes was one of its strengths, as it allowed for open discussions that were free from the pressure of negotiations. Several people used the example of the multi-stakeholder dialogue and sharing of information and good practices as proof of the Forum's viability. Papers such as the "Inventory of Good Practices", which had been posted on the Forum's website shortly before the Vilnius meeting, were mentioned as examples of more tangible results.

60. The increased participation of young people in the 2010 meeting of the Forum was seen as a positive development. A member of the youth coalition held the view that greater youth participation and listening more to young participants would help to produce more significant outcomes in areas such as censorship, privacy and the digital divide. The participants were also reminded that young people were the experts and that they brought much-needed expertise to the Forum. "Let us not waste time talking about the young, but let the young talk", he concluded.

61. The representative of Azerbaijan offered to have his country host the 2012 Forum in Baku, provided that its mandate was renewed.

62. In his closing remarks, the Chair concluded by observing that power was devolving from Governments to other actors through interconnected networks and that the Forum was part of that trend.

III. Closing session

63. The closing session was chaired by Mr. Rimvydas Vaštakas, Vice-Minister of Transport and Communications of Lithuania.

64. The speakers, representing the various stakeholder groups, commented on multi-stakeholder cooperation and the Forum's growth and maturation in the past five years. Recurring statements in the speeches included the Forum's success as a result of its flexibility and ability to keep up with emerging technology such as cloud computing, a topic that was unheard of when the Forum was established in 2005. The multi-stakeholder vehicle had proven to be a great success in creating relationships among members in different areas of society. The multi-stakeholder Forum needed to continue to broaden the process, enabling greater participation and cooperation.

65. Speakers also looked ahead to future Forums, making suggestions regarding what needed to be discussed. A speaker commented that, while the Forum provided an arena for dialogue, it had not yet begun to make recommendations to the organizations involved in Internet governance, as had been the expectation of some at the time of the Tunis Agenda.

66. In closing the 2010 meeting of the Forum, the Chair acknowledged the progress achieved by the participants in shared understanding and knowledge of

Internet governance issues. He reminded the participants that the main focus of the current Forum was "developing the future together". The meeting had looked at ways to provide better access to the Internet, make better use of the Internet and prevent its abuse. He recalled that the Internet offered unprecedented opportunities, but that it also created new challenges. In his view, the Forum was there to help to maximize opportunities and minimize challenges. The discussions held in the Forum had made it clear, once again, that achieving those objectives was possible only through collaborative action by all stakeholders.

67. He thanked all participants for contributing to the success of the meeting. They had come to Vilnius not just to listen, but also to contribute actively, organize workshops and other meetings, and engage in dialogue. That was perhaps the Forum's most important feature: all stakeholders engaged in dialogue as equals. He described dialogue as a two-way street that meant more than reading a prepared speech; it also meant listening to what others had to say. He went on to say that the sustained interest in the meetings of the Forum, in all regions of the world, clearly showed that there was a need for that kind of multi-stakeholder dialogue. Before closing the meeting, he said that the Government of Lithuania would make its voice heard in the forthcoming debate of the General Assembly, adding that it was important to renew the Forum's mandate as a multi-stakeholder platform for non-binding multi-stakeholder dialogue.

Attachment

Introductory session

Internet governance: setting the scene

1. The objective of the session was to provide participants with the historical context of the Forum and introduce the main issues of the Vilnius meeting. The session began with brief presentations by the editor and five of the experts who had authored background papers on the principal themes of the 2009 meeting in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt. The purpose of the background section (sect. II) of the book, *Internet Governance: Creating opportunities for all*[a] which had been distributed to all participants and had been made available on the Forum's website, was to provide the historical context of the Forum. Each article was intended to serve three purposes:

(a) Review how the dialogue on each theme had evolved from Athens through Sharm el-Sheikh, reviewing the main points and recurrent themes;

(b) Assess the progress that might have been achieved and review whether there had been growth in the convergence of perspectives;

(c) Offer the authors' recommendations on how the Forum might take the issues forward.

2. The author of the paper on critical Internet resources explained the sensitivity of that theme, from its origins during the World Summit on the Information Society process. She remarked that the issue had become more tractable within the Forum and offered a few reasons, including the inclusion of civil society and the Internet technical community in a discussion that previously had been limited to the intergovernmental actors in the World Summit on the Information Society. She also saw the non-decision-making nature of the Forum as key to defusing the polemics surrounding the discussions of that issue.

3. The author of the paper on openness spoke first of the progression of the discussions related to that theme in the Forum's meetings. They had moved from freedom of expression in the Internet and its relation to human rights, intellectual property and the rights of authors and consumers to the links to privacy and security and the implication in social networking. Over the five years since the Forum's establishment, it had become clear that there was a need to balance the requirements for access to knowledge, freedom of expression, the need to maintain security and the essential privacy of individuals.

4. Linguistic diversity was the focus of the chapter on diversity. The author made the point that the participants in the Forum understood the need for diversity implicitly, as they were a very diverse group of stakeholders. She spoke of the importance of the common belief that the Internet was for everyone, from the most knowledgeable technicians to indigenous people with disabilities in remote regions.

5. The co-author of the paper on access started by outlining the sub-themes that had been central to previous meetings of the Forum. In Athens, the Forum had discussed Internet exchange points (IXPs); in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, it had moved

[a] William J. Drake (ed.), Internet Governance: Creating Opportunities for All — The Fourth Internet Governance Forum, Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, 15-18 November 2009.

on to policy, regulation and the respective roles of stakeholders; in Hyderabad, India, the discussion had centred on the failure of markets, or perhaps the absence of capable markets, to improve access in many countries; and, in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, there had been an agreement on the need to establish an enabling policy and regulation environment.

6. The author of the paper on security spoke of security as an evolving need in the Internet. The Forum had dealt with the fears expressed by many and had attempted to create some understanding of the available processes and solutions. Some of the focus had been on the discussion of cybercrime and whether that was a new category of crime or essentially a crime that had always existed but was now being perpetrated via the Internet. A final point that was brought up was the lag between awareness of an issue within the technical and operational communities and the discussion of that issue in policy venues. In that regard, the Forum provided a good platform for capacity-building on security issues.

7. The two commentators gave their impressions at the end of the session. One described the book as capturing the process of the Forum in a "manner that could be called continuity in change". He noted that the Forum had delved more deeply into development as the years went on and that, because there were no specific outcome negotiations, the national participants had taken what had been discussed in the Forum, and had used it and augmented it in a regional and national context. The other commentator described the book as a reference not only for today but for years to come and not only as a description of the Sharm el-Sheikh Forum but an explanation of how the issues had evolved over the past years.

Regional perspectives

8. The moderator introduced the session by reminding participants that the spread of the Forum's multi-stakeholder model through the proliferation of regional and national processes was one of the notable successes of the Forum. The 2010 Forum devoted more space to those Forum initiatives. The main aim of the introductory session was to compare the various regional initiatives, explore their differences, find commonalities and improve linkages with the global Forum.

9. Panellists described the key priorities that had emerged from their respective meetings. The third East Africa Forum brought together stakeholders from Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania to identify, explore and build consensus around common Internet governance priority issues. The East Africa Forum was modelled on a bottom-up multi-stakeholder approach that did not mimic the agenda of the global meeting but was informed by it, and served to bring the views of the region to the global Forum. Participants at the East Africa Forum emphasized the need to harmonize regulatory frameworks to facilitate cross-border network operations.

10. The goal of the West African Forum was for the regional processes to feed into the global Forum through both messages and the experience of participants who had worked in the national and regional meetings and could bring their knowledge to the global level. The theme of the West African Forum was "Promoting the multi-stakeholder model for further Internet development in Africa", which was very much in the spirit of the theme of the global Internet Governance Forum. Participants recognized and acknowledged that, in many West African countries, democracy had yet to take firm hold and that was why it was particularly important

to have a process like the Forum to further strengthen democratic spirit and concentration on policy formulation and development.

11. The Forum process in Latin America had evolved in an interesting way. It had followed the Forum's global agenda, the intention being to identify the characteristics and the challenges, on the regional level, of each of the global themes. However, the discussion of security and privacy in the regional initiative had evolved beyond that of the global level. The participants had separated the topic of openness from privacy and security, which made it possible to make the topic more relevant to the region, focusing, for example, on freedom of expression, access to knowledge, the free flow of information, open governance, infrastructure and open technology.

12. A participant from the audience drew attention to the Caribbean Forum, which was currently in its sixth year, and the oldest of all the regional Forums, pre-dating the global Forum itself. Organized by the Caribbean Telecommunications Union and the secretariat of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the meeting addressed many of the same issues as the Latin American meeting.

13. The Asia Pacific Regional Forum was the first of its kind in the Asia Pacific region. It followed the global Internet Governance Forum agenda, and decided to adopt a simple outcome approach whereby the meeting would deliver "lessons" rather than outcomes. There was a consensus on a common interest in Internet governance for development. Participants recognized that participation by Governments was important and, at the same time, suggested that engagement on Internet governance by civil society entities that were not involved in information technology needed to be better developed and encouraged.

14. A great deal of effort had been undertaken in the Arab region since the Forum meeting in Egypt, most notably around the issues of implementing IDN ccTLDs. That work had been a success, and the Forum had played a role in achieving that important progress. A technical team responsible for Internet issues had begun work; cooperation with ITU had progressed; and a regional association of Internet service providers had improved coordination across the region. In what was seen as an important development, organizations had begun encouraging and taking public comments and multi-stakeholder input on policy process. Holding a meeting modelled on the Forum in the Arab region in the near future would help develop a clearer vision of the needs within the region.

15. One of the features of the Pan-European dialogue on Internet governance (EuroDIG) was the presentation of outcomes from the process, called "messages from Madrid". The messages were not negotiated texts; they were compiled by rapporteurs, in consultation with the organizing teams of each session, and served as key outcomes from Europe that could be discussed in the global debate. EuroDIG had an all-inclusive policy, inviting not just European participants but all interested parties. The meeting served to bridge the issues across all the national Forums in Europe, and included inputs from outside the region. The overall goal was to raise some key messages from Europe for the global debate.

16. The Commonwealth Forum identified an overwhelming need for capacity-building, a safer online environment, greater attention to the multi-stakeholder approach, and concerns about the future of the global Forum. When the Commonwealth organized programmes addressing ICT issues, the Commonwealth

Forum attempted to introduce a module into the agenda related to Internet Governance and Internet policy. The goal was to draw interested people into the relevant governance processes.

17. All panellists agreed that there would be merit in strengthening the linkages between the regional Forum initiatives and the global Forum and in exchanging information and experiences among the various regional initiatives.